

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

cul

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/811,358	03/16/2001	Gregory L. Merril	IMD004A	7776
22903 7590 01/13/2004 COOLEY GODWARD LLP ATTN: PATENT GROUP 11951 FREEDOM DRIVE, SUITE 1700 ONE FREEDOM SQUARE- RESTON TOWN CENTER			EXAMINER	
			LEUBECKER, JOHN P	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3739	
RESTON, VA	20190-5061		DATE MAILED: 01/13/2004	. 18

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		27			
•	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
` 0.00	09/811,358	MERRIL ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	John M. Mulcahy	3739			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with	n the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  Status	136(a). In no event, however, may a reg ly within the statutory minimum of thirty will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT a, cause the application to become ABA	oly be timely filed  (30) days will be considered timely.  HS from the mailing date of this communication.  NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 C	October 2003.				
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ This	action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-5,7-25,38 and 39 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-5,7-18,20-25,38 and 39 is/are rejected.  7) ☐ Claim(s) 19 is/are objected to.  8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	cepted or b) objected to be drawing(s) be held in abeyand tion is required if the drawing(s	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). i) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120					
12)					
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Inf	nmary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ormal Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Application/Control Number: 09/811,358

Art Unit: 3739

الأرار سميله

1. A new Examiner is in charge of this application. Although the previous Examiner approved the amendments made to claims 1 and 9 to place these claims in condition for allowance (see "Interview" section on page 8 of Applicant's remarks filed October 24, 2003), the new Examiner, upon review of such amendments, takes the position that the claims, as currently presented, stand rejected as set forth below. Accordingly, because of the change in position on the claims, this Office Action will not be made final.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

- 2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 3. Claims 1-5, 7-12, 15, 20, 22-25, 38 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Barnes et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,038,488) for the reasons set forth in numbered paragraph 2 of the previous Office Action, paper number 12.

Claims 1-4, 7-12, 15, 20, 22-25 and 38 have been previously addressed except for the newly added limitation of "the haptic feedback being output when the elongated member is moved a predetermined distance". Haptic feedback is output when the elongated member is moved some distance in Barnes et al. (col.4, line 66 to col.5, line 4). A predetermined distance can be any distance, which would inherently be met by the Barnes et al. device. In addition, the distance of Barnes et al. is confined by controls (simulation program) in which the distances that are tracked are "predetermined".

Application/Control Number: 09/811,358

Art Unit: 3739

As to claims 5 and 39, haptic feedback in Barnes et al. is output when the distal end of the elongated member is translated through the detector. The elongated member of Barnes et al. can be an actual instrument translated into guide slot (74) (col.9, lines 16-25) which meets the limitation of a working channel that guides the elongated member. Thus, the Barnes et al. device is configured to provide haptic feedback as the instrument is translated through and out of the guide slot.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 5. Claims 1-4, 7-18, 20-25 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alexander et al. (WO 99/39317) in view of Marcus, "Touch Feedback in Surgery, " *Proceedings of Virtual Reality and Medicine*, *The Cutting Edge*, September 8-11, 1994,pp.96-97 for the reasons set forth in numbered paragraph 3 of the previous Office Action, paper number 12.

Again, as mentioned above, a "predetermined distance" would be any distance used in the Alexander device, and thus would be anticipated by such.

Allowable Subject Matter

Page 3

Application/Control Number: 09/811,358

Art Unit: 3739

6. Claim 19 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

## Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John P. Leubecker whose telephone number is (703) 308-0951. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Linda C. M. Dvorak can be reached on (703) 308-0994. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9302.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0873.

John P. Leubecker Primary Examiner Art Unit 3739 Page 4

jpl